



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,406	07/18/2003	HanCheng Hsiung	5760-12400	5015

35690

7590

11/26/2008

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

LU, CHARLES EDWARD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/623,406		HSIUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	CHARLES E. LU		2161	

All Participants:

(1) CHARLES E. LU.

(2) Robert Kowert.

Date of Interview: 21 November 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
103 - Kampe/Raman

Claims discussed:
1

Prior art documents discussed:
Kampe

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161
/Charles E Lu/
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

Status of Application: Appeal

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 2PM

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant called the Examiner 11/21 to discuss the claims to possibly resolve some issues. The case is currently on appeal (Examiner's answer filed 10/8/2008).

Applicant proposed an amendment to the claims to add "wherein after said switch, the new data is available for access via the production database" or similar language. The purpose of the amendment is to emphasize that the new data becomes production data. The examiner discussed that if the amended language made it explicit that the new data became the production data (or equivalent language), then the proposed amended claim would overcome the prior art rejection as it currently stands, because the prior art rejection (among other things) interpreted the claim as not requiring that the new data actually becomes production data. The examiner also reminded the Applicant that any new claim amendments must be supported by the specification. Applicant will consider making amendments similar to what was discussed, and will consider filing an RCE. This interview form is used because Applicant does not intend to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.